

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/574,727	04/06/2006	David Kren	356952.00043-US	1901	
78905 Saul Ewing LI	7590 03/10/201 .P (Philadelphia)	EXAMINER			
Attn: Patent D	ocket Clerk	RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L			
2 North Secon Harrisburg, PA		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2176		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/10/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/574,727	KREN, DAVID					
Examiner	Art Unit					
AMELIA RUTLEDGE	2176					

	AMELIA RUTLEDGE	2176	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appendix for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A on event, however, will the statutory priorid for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706 07	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period civil under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a)∑ They raise new issues that would require further con (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better the application in better the properties of the place that the properties of the place that the place th	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	porroananding number of finally rais	ated alaims	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1:		cteu ciairis.	
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amandment (I	OTOL 224)
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ripliant Amendment (- TOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. \(\subseteq For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:	ered but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for a	allowance
See Continuation Sheet.	DTO/OR/ON D		
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Amelia Rutledge/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2176	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3 NOTE:

The proposed amendments will not be entered because independent claims 8 and 9 contain newly claimed limitations which narrow the scope of the claims and would require further consideration and search. Specifically, claim 8 recites "a predefined element, attribute or attribute value to enable a string based mark up language to be parsed", and claim 9 recites "a predefined element, attribute, or attribute value to enable a string based mark up language to be generated." Previously, the claims recited "...to enable a string based mark up language to be handled." Therefore the newly claimed steps to enable the language to be parsed or generated rather than "handled" narrow the scope of the claimed invention and will not be entered.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's remarks filed 03/04/2010 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests a way to map a unique integer value to tokens and strings, because no one has developed a parser for tokens and strings." See Remarks, p. 7, par. 2. However, Milau clearly discloses mapping and parsing tokens to a unique integer value. Further, applicant's arguments including the assertion of p. 7, par. 2 of the remarks, are not applicable to "parsers" as generally known in computer science. In the prior art at the time of the invention, there were numerous parsers for tokens and strings since tokens and strings were the standard input for parsers.

Further, Milau does teach the index mapping that unique integer value (a) to a token associated with a predefined element, attribute or attribute value to enable a token based mark up language to be handled; because Milau teaches defining integer tokens for the tag code space, i.e., elements, the attribute names code space and the attribute value code space (b. 5-7; Table 2).

For these reasons, and the reasons of record, the rejections of claims 1-15 are being maintained .